UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
44th meeting
held on
Friday, 12 March 1993
at 11 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 44th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ELARABY (Egypt)

CONTENTS

- Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session (continued)

- Concluding statement by the Chairman

- Conclusion of the resumed session

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

93-85435 0137V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.44
20 April 1993

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 63 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (A/47/887 AND ADD.1, 2 AND 3, CORR.1, A/47/902; A/C.1/47/14, A/C.1/47/15; A/C.1/47/L.56)

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, this morning we shall move on to the final stage of our work, action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56 submitted to the Committee on subjects before it.

As representatives are aware, the text of the draft resolution is the outcome of intensive deliberations that took place in the course of various informal consultations, including consultations within the framework of an open-ended Group. Following the informal consultations, which concluded only late yesterday afternoon, I have requested the Secretariat to circulate document A/C.1/47/L.56, which is now before the Committee for its consideration and subsequent action.

I should like to draw attention to proposed amendments to two preambular paragraphs. I have had an opportunity to consult those who have proposed them.

Consultations have been held with various delegations concerning the preambular paragraph beginning with the word "Stressing", particularly with those that propose an addition to the paragraph. The result is that I wish to put to the Committee that the paragraph should read:

"Stressing the need for the multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery to respond to the new international situation".

The words "international situation" replace "multifaceted realities of international security".

The point has also been made that in the preambular paragraph beginning

"Welcoming the Secretary-General's statement"

(The Chairman)

we must clarify what the statement was on, so I propose that at the end of the paragraph, after the words "discharge its responsibilities effectively", we add "in the field of disarmament.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): In the informal consultations yesterday evening Sri Lanka suggested that reference should be made in the preambular part of the draft resolution to non-military threats to international peace and security. The suggestion was made - I think by the representative of the Russian Federation - that that be taken into account by the introduction of the word "multifaceted". Since time was short, and in order to prevent a prolongation of the meeting, we agreed. But on further reflection, and after consulting our colleagues and others, we now find we can go along with the suggestion that you have made, Mr. Chairman. We would have been happier if a specific reference had been made to non-military threats to international peace and security, which for us are a real threat. However, we can go along with the new formulation, as it encompasses our concerns in a general way.

The CHAIRMAN: I am grateful to the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka for going along with the proposal I have made this morning.

Of course, all delegations are free to make comments and introduce changes, but I would like to draw attention to the fact that the text before the Committee is the outcome of intensive consultations and represents a certain balance. Please take that into consideration before any proposals are made.

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India): I have a proposal to bring the preambular part of the draft resolution into line with operative paragraph 1. We entirely agree with your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that "the international situation" is a more comprehensive phrase than "multifaceted realities of

(Mr. Sreenivasan, India)

international security". If we accept that, perhaps we should bring the same phrase into paragraph 1, which is a direct reference to what we shall do in the First Committee. Therefore, I suggest that we say in the second line of that paragraph: "to respond to the new international situation".

Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): Yesterday morning my delegation referred to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, the difficult conditions in the very small room in which we met in the afternoon prevented our participating in those discussions. Therefore, I wish to restate now my comments on that paragraph.

The present wording describes the four present characteristics of the Conference on Disarmament. First, it is the single global disarmament negotiating forum. Secondly, it is a body of limited composition. Thirdly, it takes its decisions on the basis of consensus. Fourthly, it maintains a special status in relationship with the United Nations.

My delegation has no difficulty with having those concepts in the draft resolution, but it sees no cause-and-effect relationship between them. Therefore, we propose the following amendment, which would retain the substance of the paragraph. In the first line after "Conference on Disarmament" we would replace "as" with "is", so that the paragraph would begin:

(spoke in English)

"Takes note of the fact that the Conference on Disarmament is the single global ...".

(Mr. Ponce, Ecuador)

What I do not want to see is the linkage, the causality, between one element and the other. But if it is a style problem to have "is" and "is", we could say "is" in the first line and "and" in the second.

(spoke in Spanish)

Then in the third line we would replace the word "maintains", which suggests the idea that the special status was lost at some point, with the word "has".

Except for a tangential reference by one delegation, my delegation has not received a reply to the request it made on Tuesday that the Chairman or a Coordinator of the Conference on Disarmament make members of this Committee that are not members of the Conference aware of the criteria that the latter will use for admission of new members; however, my delegation will not oppose the adoption of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I very much agree with the Chairman's noting, a while ago, that the text before us is a product of intensive and, I might add, open-ended consultations which were carried out yesterday. I should be very chary indeed of reopening the text for new proposals. I can agree with the change the Chairman presented in the fourth preambular paragraph on page 2, and I see that the representative of Sri Lanka would also go along with that. Those who attended these open-ended consultations yesterday know what my delegation's preference was on that particular point, but I am willing to go along with this formulation that is broader and, to my mind, much vaguer than what was certainly our preference, but I do think that we should not then move on and start reopening the operative paragraphs; and I would suggest and appeal to delegations that we not proceed in that way and that we keep the operative paragraphs and the balance to which the Chairman also referred and not reopen operative paragraph 1, for example.

Mrs. LAOSE-AJAYI (Nigeria): I should just like to put on record that my delegation would have preferred the way the preambular paragraph was yesterday evening because, as I mentioned yesterday, we would have preferred a definition of what the the First Committee would be taking charge of; and since we are talking about arms control and disarmament machinery, I think we all understand that that deals with the international security situation and not just "situation" vaguely, which can be related to any issue. We believe that "international security situation" would have defined which type of situation. But we are not insisting; we just wish to register our preference for yesterday's formulation.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico is pleased at the draft resolution that we are about to adopt, which is the result of this resumed session of the First Committee. I should like to say that we support the suggestion of the Indian delegation and that we understand the sense of the proposal by our colleague from the Ecuadorian delegation.

Apart from a few observations on the Spanish version of A/C.1/47/L.56, which we shall forward to the Secretariat for its consideration, we wish to go on record with our interpretation of the content of paragraph 9. We consider that when we speak of strengthening the Office of Disarmament Affairs we should understand that to mean the Office here at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): We were working on this under pressure yesterday in the informal consultations, and in the process we, unfortunately, forgot the point relating to the Security Council, to which reference was made in the original resolution by which this resumed session is being held. I

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

would suggest that we pick up the language of the resolution itself and put it in as the second preambular paragraph, which would read,

"Bearing in mind the competence of the Security Council in these matters,".

This would come as the second preambular paragraph, and it is language that is taken from the original resolution. Then we will have taken note of all the organs and machinery to which this resumed session was supposed to give some consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: The Ambassador of Pakistan has proposed a new paragraph as the second preambular paragraph. I understand that it would follow "Recalling" and precede "Taking note".

I call on the President of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria), President of the Conference on Disarmament: We have heard the proposal of the representative of Ecuador with respect to operative paragraph 5, which deals with the Conference on Disarmament. I believe this proposal is strictly editorial. If the Committee wishes to go along with the changes suggested by Ecuador, we may need some final polishing of the text to make the paragraph read a bit better. These additional changes are as follows:

In the second line of paragraph 5, the words "is a body of" could be replaced by "with a"; so it would read, "...negotiating forum with a limited composition...".

In the third line, between the words "consensus" and "maintains", we can drop "and" and replace it with "which". It would then read,

"...on the basis of consensus, which maintains its special status in relationship...".

(Mr. Deyanov, President, Conference on Disarmament)

I strongly suggest that we retain the word "maintains" because it is a consensus word within the Conference on Disarmament, but if there is very stong feeling against it, we can say "which has a special status", but I do not prefer this second option.

The CHAIRMAN: Later, I shall try to go through all the proposals. I repeat once again that, of course, every delegation has the sovereign right to come up with proposals, but the fact that much work has been invested in this exercise should be taken into consideration. There is already a consensus on the text; so, please, the less we touch the wording, the better.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I should like to thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the document that we now have before us. I think it is a worthwhile product of the elegant and effective consultations through which you have led us.

I have asked to speak in order to express my pleasure at what I observed in the Committee on Tuesday, 9 March.

I am very grateful to my colleague from Pakistan for having brought up the matter of the missing preambular paragraph in relation to the competence of the Security Council. As will be recalled, on Tuesday I referred to this element of our mandate, as laid down in the text of 9 December last. I wish to support the proposal made by Ambassador Kamal of Pakistan.

For the rest, I am in complete agreement with what our colleague from Finland said a moment ago. I think the better course today would be not to reopen any paragraph of the operative part of the present text.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation also welcomes the stage we have reached as a result of our consultations - so wisely led by you, Mr. Chairman - with the issuance today of document A/C.1/47/L.56, which is quite a well-balanced text.

I wish merely to make a brief comment on the eighth preambular paragaraph, in regard to which you have made a proposal, Mr. Chairman. My delegation thinks we should follow that proposal and refer to the "new international situation".

I wish to raise a small but important point. Whereas the English and French versions of the eighth preambular paragraph refer to "multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery", the Spanish version uses the word "agency". No such "agency" exists. I would ask that the Spanish text be corrected.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

With regard to operative paragraph 5, the ideas expressed by our colleague from Ecuador do not, in our view, change the substance of the paragraph. They could be combined with what was suggested by our colleague from Bulgaria. That would make the text much clearer - at least in Spanish.

Nevertheless, my delegation would like to make an appeal in regard to this paragraph. Yesterday we had a very intensive and, finally, a very satisfactory exchange of views. But when we refer to the Conference on Disarmament, perhaps it is not clear that we have in mind the "single multilateral negotiating forum", because all the language versions of the text speak of the "single global disarmament negotiating forum". Although my delegation believes that we should not reopen discussion on the paragraphs of this document, we would all agree, I think, that it would be useful to make this correction and refer to the Conference on Disarmament as the "only multilateral negotiating forum". My delegation is among those that feels that we should not reopen the discussion of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, but we think that everyone would agree that correcting the phrase in paragraph 5 to read "single multilateral negotiating forum" would be in conformity with everyone's understanding of the matter.

Finally, with regard to operative paragraph 9, my delegation agrees with the representative of Mexico that when we refer to strengthening the Office of Disarmament Affairs, we have in mind the Office at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Mr. ERRERA (France)(interpretation from French): I do not wish to prolong the debate and would therefore merely support what was said by our colleague from Finland and the Ambassador of the Netherlands a moment ago. Let us make sure that we do not reopen the delicate balance we achieved

(Mr. Errera, France)

yesterday, in conditions of the greatest transparency and after great efforts made by all to find an acceptable text.

That is why, at the risk of creating serious trouble for myself from the President of the Conference on Disarmament upon our return to Geneva, I must say that I do not see the necessity, or even the possibility or the desirability, of altering paragraph 5, which deals with the Conference on Disarmament. It seems to me that this paragraph was drafted with very great care, taking into account the various elements of the situation, and that any attempt to change it would lead us into a debate that I am not sure would have a positive result.

To sum up, we can agree with the few changes announced by you, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of the meeting, but we do not wish to see paragraph 5 altered.

The CHAIRMAN: Other representatives are requesting to be allowed to speak. I am concerned that new proposals will be made, and, to be quite frank, I think it would be detrimental to our work to reopen matters that we had thought were concluded yesterday. I repeat that every delegation of course has a perfect right to raise anything it considers it necessary to raise. I would merely urge members to take into account that the result obtained yesterday was a consensus and that we should maintain the balance of everything that was agreed upon then.

We shall now hear the representatives who wish to speak on this matter and, with the Committee's permission, I shall then try to summarize where we stand.

Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): My delegation can accept the changes that you announced, Mr. Chairman, earlier in the meeting; but, for the rest, I would strongly support what my colleagues from Finland, the Netherlands and France have said - namely, that we should not reopen the discussion on the operative part of this draft resolution. That would be, as you have said, Mr. Chairman, detrimental to our work and to the possibility of success.

I actually wished to speak in order to make a comment on operative paragraph 9. Like other delegations that have spoken today, we wish to make it clear that our understanding is that the Office of Disarmament Affairs referred to in the paragraph is the Office of Disarmament here in New York.

Mr. WHANNOU (Benin)(interpretation from French): First, my delegation congratulates you, Mr. Chairman, on the effort that was made to ensure the presentation to us of a text that takes into account the concerns of everyone.

We do not intend to reopen the debate on what has already been accepted. Nevertheless, we must make a comment on operative paragraph 7, in which the General Assembly would encourage

> "the Conference on Disarmament to reach early agreement on the expansion of its membership." (A/C.1/47/L.56, para. 7)

(Mr. Whannou, Benin)

We shall not oppose adoption of this text. Nevertheless, we wish to stress that what is of importance here is the manner in which the agreement is reached rather than the agreement itself.

We have resumed our work because the new international situation calls for a new approach to the question of disarmament, which for a long time was a process that responded to the balance of power. Today, international security has acquired a new dimension, given the interdependence that characterizes our world today. Therefore there is a need to integrate disarmament - which is now becoming everyone's concern - into international security. For example, even those who possess no nuclear weapons have an interest in seeing the world free of those weapons, which pose a threat to the security of all, even if only the threat of an accident.

In the course of our exchange of views on Monday, 8 March, we heard it said that all parties should shoulder their responsibility with regard to disarmament. While recognizing the importance of a negotiating structure in the field of disarmament, we believe that if we wish to make disarmament the responsibility of all, we should seriously consider the status of the Conference on Disarmament vis-à-vis the General Assembly, which we consider to be the forum in which Member States give a political direction to the resolution of problems that are their common concern.

The Secretary of the Conference, who has the responsibility of assisting the Conference and its Chairman, is the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. The Conference receives logistical and technical support from the United Nations. Section IV, "Machinery", of the Final Document of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, referring to the Conference by its previous name, states that

(Mr. Whannou, Benin)

"the membership of the Committee on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals". (S-10/2, sect. IV, para. 120)

The question of reviewing its composition today does not, therefore, give rise to any difficulties. The Conference has acquired a measure of experience, which should enable it to give Member States a better indication of how matters should evolve. That cannot, however, be done without the General Assembly.

Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): I apologize for making a statement when I had not intended to do so. I also wish to express once again my delegation's gratitude to you, Sir, for all your efforts.

My reason for speaking again this morning relates to the new amendments proposed. Some are minor ones, which my delegation can accept now, such as the replacement of the words "multifaceted realities of international security" in one of the preambular paragraphs with the words "international situation".

I have some difficulty, however, in accepting the major amendment that has just been proposed by the representative of Pakistan concerning the role of the Security Council in these matters. That proposal is vague and, moreover, requires a commitment that I personally could not make at the present juncture. We negotiated a text, we reached consensus with difficulty, and now we find that a major proposal has been advanced after my Government had unambiguously expressed a different view on this question.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I shall try to be very brief. I too support the proposed changes to the preamble that you, Mr. Chairman, have put forward, and regarding the operative paragraphs, I support all those who have followed your lead in suggesting that we should not seek to reopen discussions on the delicately balanced text before us.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

However, my main purpose in speaking at this time, like that of the representatives of Mexico and Sweden, is to state with respect to paragraph 9 that Canada too takes the reference to strengthening the Office of Disarmament Affairs to mean strengthening that Office here at United Nations Headquarters, because, as we have stated in informals consultations, in our view, strengthening of the Office of Disarmament Affairs cannot be accomplished by dividing it up.

Further to the Secretary-General's commitment to strengthening the Secretariat's capacity in the field of disarmament, we believe that concrete steps can be taken before the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly and within existing budgetary resources to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs - to give just one possible example, by allowing the Office of Disarmament Affairs to staff the posts that are currently allocated to it.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria): I should like to speak again as the representative of Bulgaria, not in my capacity as President of the Conference on Disarmament.

In my previous statement, I was also speaking as the representative of Bulgaria. In that capacity, I said that if this Committee wants to go along with the proposal by Ecuador, that would require a final polishing of paragraph 5 as amended. I then suggested slight changes in order to make it read better. If the Committee does not wish to go along with that proposal, that is all right with me; I like paragraph 5 very much as it now stands.

As the President of the Conference, however, I would very much like to respect the results of your consultations, Sir. Before we had this draft you submitted today, I strongly advised that we should not change paragraph 5 as it stands now in your draft.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

Speaking again as the representative of Bulgaria, I would prefer that we should refrain from making any changes in paragraphs 8, 9 and 10. I believe that this is an important achievement of your consultations, Sir, and that we should not reopen discussions on the delicate balance that is now at hand. Our reading of the activities of the Office of Disarmament Affairs is that it serves the needs of the Conferences, both in New York and in Geneva, very well, and that this should continue through strengthening the resources and the staff of the Office.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like at this point to share with you my thinking on where we stand. We have a text before us in document A/C.1/47/L.56 that was negotiated among all delegations in an open-ended manner. The text could be polished here and there - as any text could - but we must be very careful if we are to enter an area that could really tilt the balance one way or another. That could create difficulties for a number of delegations, and we would find ourselves going back to where we were yesterday morning. As we have only today to finish, that would be impossible, since I understand that some of the delegations have already booked their departures for today. I would therefore request that we should look very carefully at where we stand and how we want to proceed.

I should like to start with the proposal made by Pakistan, and I should like to address the representative of Algeria and everyone else on that particular proposal.

What the representative of Pakistan read out was part of decision 47/422 verbatim - word for word. In the midst of our consultations yesterday, we decided that we would proceed point by point as in decision 47/422, that is to say, we would take up the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament and the Office of Disarmament Affairs.

(The Chairman)

What was an oversight - perhaps I should say an oversight on my part - was that we did not look into the following words, which were agreed to as a consensus decision by the First Committee and the General Assembly on 9 December. In the sixth and seventh line of that decision, after the words "of the said machinery", there is the phrase:

"bearing in mind the competence of the Security Council in those matters."

That is exactly what we have agreed upon; it is not new. What the representative of Pakistan proposed today is that we repeat the exact words in decision 47/422, which was a consensus decision. Therefore, I suggest to the representative of Algeria, who I believe was the only one to raise this point, that he think about the matter again.

Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, when you mention that the words are in fact the exact words used in decision 47/422. The only difference is that, as proposed by the Ambassador of Pakistan, this would become a separate, independent preambular paragraph. I suggest that we consider the possibility of using the expression exactly as it appears in decision 47/422, which means adding these words in the first preambular paragraph after "of the said machinery" at the end, continuing the sentence with the words

"bearing in mind the competence of the Security Council in those matters".

Then we would have a precise reproduction of the text of paragraph (a) of decision 47/422.

I think that what would raise a problem is separating this into a separate preambular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to propose that, because I think this is the only change from what was decided upon during the General Assembly. If we add exactly what was in the General Assembly decision, I hope that that will be agreeable to everyone.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I, too, recognize that it comes right out of our mandate. The problem is that we were not careful when we hastily drafted that mandate. The Security Council does not have responsibility with regard to the machinery; it has responsibility under Article 26 of the Charter with regard to peace-keeping and so on, matters related to disarmament. Therefore, I think that the Brazilian solution is the better one.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the representative of Algeria agrees and that we shall reproduce the wording of the decision. This is the first point that we can dispose of.

I shall now return to some of the other points, starting with the preamble. After several delegations had brought the matter to my attention, I conveyed to the Committee the proposal concerning the words "the new international situation". We heard that some representatives would have preferred the other phrase, but they said that they were not insisting, so I take it that we can accept the wording "the new international situation" in the eighth preambular paragraph.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I can accept the change as proposed by you, Mr. Chairman, on condition that a concomitant change is not made in operative paragraph 1, because that would eliminate all reference to "the new realities of international security".

The CHAIRMAN: I was coming to that later.

I also believe that adding the words "in the field of disarmament" at the end of the eleventh preambular paragraph will create no problems for anyone. I take it that everyone accepts that.

We have heard views on two operative paragraphs. I agree with the Vice-Chairman, the representative of Finland, and several other representatives, who have suggested today that we should leave all the operative paragraphs untouched.

Every text could be improved; every text could be polished. But we cannot gain consensus on every text. Therefore, I appeal to all delegations - without referring to any one in particular - to maintain the balance that we attained yesterday afternoon after long consultations. No delegation that raised a point, whether on paragraph 2 or paragraph 5, considered it to be of a serious nature. It is accepted that we should improve a text, make it consistent, make it clear, so that there will be no possible misunderstanding on some points. But we know how we reach agreements in the United Nations. I shall not use the word "compromise", because sometimes people consider that it has a bad connotation, but we have to reconcile certain views and maintain a certain balance.

So my appeal is that we go ahead now and accept the draft as it stands, with the minor changes that we have introduced in the preambular paragraphs. We can then conclude our work. I shall be grateful if this is accepted without anyone speaking now. After we have adopted the draft resolution every delegation will be free to put on record its point of view and to make it clear whether a certain point should have appeared in a certain way in order to be consistent with the other paragraphs or should be in any other form.

(The Chairman)

I am grateful to all delegations for heeding my appeal, so that we may move to the next stage.

The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56. First, I ask the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56, with its amendment to the first preambular paragraph and the two revisions to two other preambular paragraphs, the one beginning "Stressing" and the one beginning "Welcoming", I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

"Under the terms of operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would urge the Secretary-General to take concrete steps to strengthen the Office for Disarmament Affairs in order to ensure that it has the necessary means and resources to carry out its mandated tasks and would request him to report to the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly on those steps. Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56 and the implementation of operative paragraph 9 have programme budget implications, these would be reflected in the proposed programme budget for 1994-1995."

The CHAIRMAN: I propose that the Committee now adopt draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56, as amended and revised, without a vote.

The draft resolution, as amended and revised, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The draft resolution, as amended and revised, having been adopted without a vote, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position after that decision.

Mr. FULE (Czech Republic): For the sake of clarity and reflection in official documents, let me state, on behalf of the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic, that the question of the membership of the Slovak Republic as a successor of Czechoslovak participation in the Conference on Disarmament is to be settled as soon as possible, and there should be no linkage to the consideration of the expansion of the Conference membership which is going on in Geneva.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I should like to express the great joy of my delegation at the First Committee's having adopted this important resolution a moment ago. I should like to pay tribute, Sir, to your great skills as our Chairman. I have enjoyed very much the elegant, effective and determined way in which you have conducted the consultations and the proceedings of the First Committee.

Allow me to make one interpretive statement which I had not planned to make but which, I think, my duty commands me to make. It pertains to paragraph 9. My delegation recognizes the rights of delegations to give interpretations to the wording relating to the strengthening of the Office of Disarmament Affairs. However, my delegation does not interpret this language in the same way as some preceding speakers have done. In fact, I do not recall that during our informal consultations the particular interpretation offered earlier this morning had been made.

My delegation would like to stick to what is printed. After all, we deal here with a matter which pertains to the prerogatives of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): I should like to join the representative of the Netherlands in congratulating you on the way in which you have handled our proceedings this week. I heeded your appeal not to press for any amendments to the operative part of the draft resolution, but I should say for the record that my delegation would have preferred paragraph 9 to read:

"Urges the Secretary-General to take necessary measures to ensure that the Office of Disarmament Affairs has sufficient means and resources to carry out its mandated tasks".

We are not, therefore, convinced of the need for strengthening.

Having said that, I, like the representative of the Netherlands, do not share the view expressed by our colleagues from the delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Canada with regard to their interpretation of the same paragraph. In my delegation's view, the mandated tasks referred to exist in Geneva as well as in New York.

Miss CABALLERO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to express our satisfaction at the adoption of this important document and also to congratulate you, Sir, and express our gratitude for your skilful leadership, which has enabled us to conclude our endeavours successfully.

My delegation would like to put on record our position that, as we repeatedly stated in the informal meetings, we do not feel that the Office of Disarmament Affairs can be strengthened by moving it to Geneva, either in part or in whole. By the same token, we do not believe that any fragmentation of that body can contribute to its strengthening. In addition, we hope that the report the Secretary-General is to submit in accordance with paragraph 10 will reflect and contain the concerns voiced on various occasions by my delegation and others regarding the elements they would like to see included in that

(Miss Caballero, Colombia)

report, in order that delegations may have at their disposal the material needed to evaluate the pertinent decisions that will be taken by the Secretary-General. Lastly, my delegation, like others, believes that paragraph 9 should refer to the Office of Disarmament Affairs in New York.

Mr. BANGALI (Sierra Leone): My delegation would like to thank you most sincerely, Mr. Chairman, for the guidance you have given us in this session. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank the Secretariat personally for the work it has done: excellent job. In this regard, I should also like to put on record my thanks to the members of the delegation of Denmark for the paper they introduced on behalf of the European Economic Community. Almost every fire that breaks out is started by a person who never started a fire before. They started that fire, and they deserve some credit. My delegation wants to thank them most earnestly.

My delegation participated fully in all the deliberations of this resumed session. We have heard all the statements, the interventions of most delegations, and we have also read all the papers, even those that are floating, and my Government is deeply gratified about the outcome of these deliberations. This is why I take the opportunity to thank you most sincerely, Mr. Chairman, for the guidance you have given us in the First Committee, in the hope that all the decisions, the speakers, the interventions of delegations that have been pointed out will be reflected in good faith when the decisions of this resumed session are considered.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): We join the others who have remarked that your leadership this week, Sir, has been nothing short of brilliant. We also join Mexico, Sweden and Canada in stating our interpretation of paragraph 9, although in slightly different terms. We think

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

that both New York and Geneva should be strengthened without moving any elements from the former to the latter.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): We congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the success to which you have led us. In addition to what we said a few moments ago about paragraph 9, we wish to put on record our concern over the expression "new realities", which appears in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56. We do not quite understand its meaning and scope, and we therefore await a clarification, especially from those delegations that pressed for its inclusion.

Mr. AMBEYI-LIGABO (Kenya): It is the wish of my delegation, first of all, to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for the exemplary manner in which you have carried out the work of our resumed session. Secondly, I should like to commend the Secretariat, particularly the Office of Disarmament Affairs, and all the delegations for the good work which has been done.

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

It is the Kenyan delegation's intention to put on record its interpretation of operative paragraph 9.

Kenya believes, and it is its understanding, that the concrete steps to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs are meant to strengthen this Office here in New York. Kenya believes that moving any parts or elements of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to any other office apart from United Nations Headquarters here in New York would not in any way strengthen it. It is our clear understanding of operative paragraph 9 that what is meant is strengthening the Office of Disarmament Affairs in New York.

Mr. PONCE (Ecuador)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to join in the congratulations that have been addressed to you, Mr. Chairman. Once again you have displayed your great professionalism, your leadership, and your skills in reconciling opposing views. We have been extremely pleased with the way in which you have conducted our proceedings.

The reference that my delegation made to its difficulties in participating yesterday did not, of course, relate in any way to a lack of transparency; rather, it related to the size of the room in which we were meeting, which prevented me from following in detail the very interesting contributions by the representative of China; I also had great difficulty in following the contributions by the representative of the Russian Federation. But that is the limit of my complaint about the conditions in which we worked yesterday. Your part in our work was indeed impeccable, as indeed it has been ever since you assumed the chairmanship of the Committee.

My delegation, like other delegations, would like briefly to comment on some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution we have just adopted.

(Mr. Ponce, Ecuador)

First, the concept of "new realities" referred to in operative paragraph 1 is, we believe, inconsisent with operative paragraph 8. My delegation would have preferred the concept of "new international situation", which is clearer and lends itself to less confusion.

The delegation of Ecuador also believes that operative paragraph 5, which sets forth the four features of the Conference on Disarmament, does not establish any cause-and-effect relationship between those features.

It is Ecuador's understanding that operative paragraph 7 does not prejudge the appropriate legal mechanism for the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, nor the competence of the General Assembly to express its views on the agreement the Conference will reach on this matter.

Regarding operative paragraph 8, we reiterate our request that the Secretary-General, before taking any decisions on transferring units of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to the Geneva Office, should send to Governments the technical documents on which such decisions would be based.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation)(interpretation from Russian): Now that we have successfully concluded our work this week, I should like to join other representatives in congratulating you on the way in which you have conducted our proceedings. Of course, I cannot fail to refer to the very important positive contribution you made to our success.

Some statements have been made here in regard to operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution we have just adopted. We cannot agree with some of the interpretations we have heard to the effect that the strengthening of the Office of Disarmament Affairs, referred to in that paragraph, is limited to the Office in New York. The Office of Disarmamert Affairs has tasks of its own and various units in New York and in Geneva to carry them out. I share

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

the view of representatives who have already spoken that the concrete steps referred to in operative paragraph 9 come within the competence of the Secretary-General.

Mr. ERRERA (France)(interpretation from French): You will not be surprised, Mr. Chairman, if I join all those who have paid a tribute to you for the exemplary way in which you have led our work. Thanks to the consensus reached in the consultations held prior to this resumed session, to the transparency of the consultations held here, and to your great authority, you were able to ensure that we reached a compromise on matters on which it was not at all obvious that we would be able to agree. I congratulate you very warmly on that.

In regard to operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution we have just adopted, my delegation fully shares the views expressed by the Ambassador of the United Kingdom and a moment ago by the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. MFULA (Zambia): I wish to join preceding speakers in congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, on the exemplary way in which you have guided the First Committee's work.

My comments are restricted to operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. It is my delegation's understanding that the "concrete steps to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs" relate to the Office here in New York.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): We have been talking this week about new realities. One deplorable new reality occurred overnight and this morning. I am referring to the North Korean announcement that it is withdrawing from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

The United States joins the international community in deploring this announcement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. If I am correctly informed, this morning it actually gave the Security Council notice of its intention to withdraw. This action clearly contradicts the commitment by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea under both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula not to possess or develop nuclear weapons.

The United States calls upon North Korea to withdraw its statement immediately and to take steps, including full cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), to begin the process of restoring international confidence that North Korea is fulfilling its international responsibilities in the nuclear area. North Korea's obligations to the IAEA remain in force for 90 days even though it has formally notified the Security Council and all member parties. As far as the IAEA is concerned, that organization's Board of Governors adopted a resolution without opposition on 25 February this year calling on North Korea to fulfil its responsibilities under the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its IAEA safeguards agreement.

The United States Permanent Representative will speak further on this matter this afternoon in the Security Council.

Mr. WU Chengjiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): We have just adopted the draft resolution unanimously. This marks the complete success of this session, and we would like to express our satisfaction at this outcome.

With respect to the success of this session, we should also praise - in addition to the cooperation among the delegations - the exemplary leadership of the Chairman, and we would like to express our appreciation to you, Sir.

With regard to paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, requesting a report from the Secretary-General, we hope that this report will be more comprehensive and transparent so as to facilitate understanding with regard to the mandate of the Office of Disarmament Affairs and command greater support from delegations.

I support the statement made by the representative of Colombia.

Mr. JUSUF (Indonesia): My delegation would like to join previous speakers in thanking you, Mr. Chairman, for the excellent results of our deliberations.

With regard to operative paragraph 9, my delegation would like to state once again that it is our wish that the Office of Disarmament Affairs remain in New York.

Mrs. KABA (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): I should like also to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the work done this week as well as on the manner in which you guided these consultations and reached a consensus on the text in document A/C.1/47/L.56.

However, my delegation would like to mention, for the record, that the expression "new international situation" in preambular paragraph 9 does not fully reflect our concern to take into account the non-military aspects of

(Mrs. Kaba, Côte d'Ivoire)

security, which seem better reflected in the expression "multifaceted realities of international security".

As to operative paragraph 7, my delegation believes that if we are to strengthen the democratization process in the United Nations system, the membership of the Conference on Disarmament should be increased and the States that wish to join it accepted. To give that body the authority to decide on its expansion could hinder and slow down this democratization process, which should be reflected in that body just as in any other that deals with international peace and security.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): I apologize for speaking again, but I should like to read out from the statement issued by my Government in London this morning following the decision of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to withdraw from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT):

> "North Korea's decision is a cause for great concern and, following its refusal to allow International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) special inspections, gives further cause to question the intentions of the North Korean Government. The United Kingdom is determined to maintain and strengthen the NPT. We shall consider with the other States Parties what steps to take. The Treaty states that a country announcing its withdrawal must provide three months' notice to all other parties and to the Security Council. This notice must include a statement of the extraordinary events related to the subject-matter of the Treaty which it regards as having jeopardized its supreme national interests and given rise to the withdrawal".

(Mr. Weston, United Kingdom)

I understand that the Security Council has now been formally notified of the decision of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Council will no doubt wish to consider that decision.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I apologize also for taking the floor again, for the same reason as the representative of the United States and the representative of the United Kingdom.

The authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have announced today their decision to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty. As we understand it, the Security Council has just been notified of that decision. For us, and I think for the international community as a whole, it is a very serious decision, an unprecedented decision, a decision which the French Government condemns most strongly.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): I should also like to apologize for the Russian delegation's taking the floor for the second time, but I cannot gloss over the communication that we learned of this morning to the effect that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has decided to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). We must note that the news of the decision cannot fail to alarm us. We consider and hope that this hasty decision is not final. The Russian Federation, as one of the depositary Powers of the NPT, attaches great importance to its strengthening. Any action that would weaken that Treaty, no matter what the pretext, cannot fail to cause regret and alarm. That is why we supported, and continue fully to support, the recent decision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on this matter, including the resolution of its Board of Governors of 25 February of this year.

Mr. SUH (Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Republic of Korea also would like to express its opinion on the announcement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of its decision to withdraw from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We believe that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea can never be justified in withdrawing from the NPT for its professed reasons. "Team Spirit" is an annual military exercise of a defensive nature involving only conventional weapons. The decision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to ask for additional information on undeclared nuclear facilities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been supported by consensus vote of the Board of Governors of the IAEA, and the Republic of Korea fully supports the actions taken by the IAEA.

The Republic of Korea regards this move by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as an open and serious challenge to the global system for preventing nuclear proliferation. It poses a great threat not only to the stability of the Korean peninsula but also to the peace and security of the world. Therefore we strongly urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to immediately retract its announced decision to withdraw from the NPT, allow the IAEA to inspect the two undeclared sites according to the IAEA's resolution adopted on 25 February and thus clear up international suspicions about its nuclear ambitions.

We also urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to agree to expeditiously conduct mutual inspections between South and North Korea, as it has promised in the Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, in order to ensure that peninsula has actually been denuclearized.

Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): I wish to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries.

The Nordic countries deplore the announcement of the DPRK that it will withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This action will have very negative effects on international efforts in the field of non-proliferation. We strongly urge the DPRK to reconsider its decision as soon as possible.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): I should like add my voice to those who have expressed dismay at the decision of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty. My delegation, together with those that have already spoken, most profoundly deplores this decision.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): On behalf of the Government of Australia, I wish to join the depositaries of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the other nations that have spoken in deploring the decision announced this morning by the DPRK to withdraw from the Treaty. The Australian Government has already expressed its concern, and we shall do so again when the Security Council provides an opportunity to pursue this matter.

Ms. MASON (Canada): Canada, too, deplores and condemns the DPRK's unprecedented decision to withdraw from the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Like many others who have spoken before us, we strongly urge the DPRK to rescind its decision as soon as possible.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

THE CHAIRMAN: With the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56, the Committee has now concluded the work with which it was entrusted at this resumed session of the First Committee, which has been held in pursuance of decision 47/422.

The results of our endeavours are reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.56, which we have just adopted, the product of extensive

(The Chairman)

consultations, which, indeed, began even prior to the commencement of our formal meetings; they took place here in New York and in Geneva.

The task before us was not an easy one, especially in view of the very short time-frame at our disposal. I wish to underline the fact that, due to the intensive contribution of all concerned, the constructive and cooperative spirit that prevailed throughout the deliberations and the input provided by the delegations through their useful suggestions and proposals, it became possible successfully to complete our work today.

The resolution will be forwarded to the General Assembly for appropriate action.

Let me express the sincere hope that our recommendations will receive the consideration that they deserve, thereby creating the opportunity for a substantial contribution towards enhancing the multilateral disarmament machinery, including the deliberative and negotiating bodies, which is the rationale behind the General Assembly decision to convene the resumed session.

I also want to inform the Committee that, pursuant to operative pargraph 2 of the draft resolution, I have been requested, in my capacity as Chairman of the First Committee during the forty-seventh session, to continue the necessary consultations on the futher rationalization of the work and effective functioning of the First Committee, taking into account all the views and proposals presented to it, including those related to the thematic clustering of agenda items. Accordingly, it is my intention to present an oral report on the results of my consultations during the early part of the Committee's meetings at the next session of the General Assembly.

May I now avail myself of this opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to all delegations and in particular to the officers of the Committee - the two Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Patokallio and Mr. Suh, and the Rapporteur,

(The Chairman)

Mr. Zaleski - as well as the President of the Conference on Disarmament and the Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, for the meaningful and constructive contributions that were made. May I also express my gratitude for the exemplary manner and tireless efforts of Mr. Kheradi, the Committee Secretary, and the Committee's staff, as well as the Director of the Office of Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic, and the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Berasategui. All their efforts facilitated the successful outcome of our work.

I should also like to thank the interpreters and the conference officers for their efforts and their contribution to the success of these meetings.

CONCLUSION OF THE RESUMED SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee has thus concluded the consideration of agenda item 63.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.